REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-38 and 43-48 are pending in this application. Claims 13, 20, and 21 are currently being amended to correct clerical errors.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-27, 29-32, 34-38 and 43-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,502,137) hereinafter "Peterson" in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,578) hereinafter "Cox".

The methods and system of the present invention are directed at enabling a target computer without any pre-configuration to access and execute a requested application program resident on a server system. The methods are enabled by a helper application that is resident and executes on the target computer, the helper application configuring the computer to execute the application program by reading an application descriptor provided by the server system in response to the request and determining from the application descriptor the necessary configuration required to execute the application program. Further, the helper application controls the computer to execute the application program using the configuration it determined. Thus, the helper application determines if the requested application is executable, if it requires a particular configuration, and then controls its instantiation. The methods and systems of the present invention allow a computer to execute different application programs by building dynamically the required configuration, and controlling the execution of each application program.

In contrast, and as articulated in previous responses, Peterson is directed to providing a security mechanism for implementation where a client computer has requested video/audio data from an application server (Col. 1, lines 58-61). The client computer of Peterson has a multimedia subsystem 141 resident on it to play the video or audio data on the client computer (Col. 5, lines 23-34). It should be noted that the client (target) computer of the present invention does not have the multimedia subsystem resident on it, but instead, uses the helper application to identify what additional program elements are required to instantiate the application program requested from the server system which could be any program not just video/audio data, and then launching and controlling the instantiation.

Applicant continues to respectfully disagree with the characterization of Peterson.

Cox describes the management of configurable application programs on a network by using program files for each configurable application program. The application program is installed on a server coupled to the network followed by the distribution of an application launcher program associated with the application program to a client computer coupled to the network. Cox requires a custom application launcher program to be installed on the server system and distributed to a client computer with each individual application.

In contrast to the teachings of Cox, Applicant's invention teaches a helper application that is resident and executes on the client computer, and is not distributed by the server system as required by Cox. Applicant's helper application is used to configure and execute any and all application programs to be run on the target computer and is thus, a universal helper application as contrasted with each individual applet required to be loaded on the server and then distributed to the client computer (Cox, col. 7, lines 66-67; col. 8, lines 1-20).

Peterson and Cox, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in Applicant's claims. There is further no suggestion or motivation either in Peterson or Cox or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in a manner resulting in Applicant's claimed invention.

For the reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all pending claims.

3. Claims 9, 14, 28, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Cox and in further view of de Hond.

The combination of Peterson, Cox and de Hond fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in Applicant's claims due to the lack of foundation for the rejection as discussed here in before with regard to both the Peterson and Cox reference. Further, neither de Hond, Peterson nor Cox contain any suggestion as to the combination of the three references to make up for the shortcomings of their teachings.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 14, 28 and 33.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, we believe that all the pending claims are allowable and therefore ask the Examiner to allow them to issue.

A Petition for a three-month Extension of Time is hereby requested. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Monica Grewal

Monica Grewal
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 40,056
monica.grewal@wilmerhale.com

Date: June 1, 2005

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000, ext. 6223
Fax: (617) 526-5000

PTO/[illegible] (Modified)

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION IN AN APPLICATION

November 15, 2000

(Use several sheets if necessary)

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	APPLICATION NO.
2704.1001-004	09/527,188
APPLICANT: David M. Greschler *et al.*	
FILING DATE: March 17, 2000	GROUP: 2787

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB-CLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	AA	6,101,549	08/08/00	Baugher *et al.*	709	238	
	AB	5,941,908	08/24/99	Goldsteen *et al.*	623	1	
	AC	5,826,014	10/20/98	Coley *et al.*	395	187.01	
	AD	5,758,074	05/26/98	Marlin *et al.*	395	200.8	
	AE	6,138,162	10/24/00	Pistriotto *et al.*	709	229	
	AF	6,119,165	09/12/00	Li *et al.*	709	229	
	AG	6,012,090	01/04/00	Chung *et al.*	709	219	
	AH						
	AI						
	AJ						
	AK						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUB-CLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	AL							
	AM							
	AN							
	AO							
	AP							
	AQ							

OTHER DOCUMENTS *(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)*

	AR	
	AS	
	AT	

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED

PTO-1449 REPRODUCED

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
DISCLOSURE CITATION
IN AN APPLICATION

January 3, 2001

(Several sheets if necessary)

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	APPLICATION NO.
2704.1001-004	09/527,188
APPLICANT: David M. Greschler *et al.*	
FILING DATE: March 17, 2000	GROUP: 2787

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB-CLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	AA						
	AB						
	AC						
	AD						
	AE						
	AF						
	AG						
	AH						
	AI						
	AJ						
	AK						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUB-CLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	AL	EP0778512A2	JUN 11 97	EPO				
	AM	WO 98/07085	FEB 19 98	PCT				
	AN							
	AO							
	AP							
	AQ							

OTHER DOCUMENTS ***(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)***

	AR	Domel, P., "Mobile Telescript Agents and the Web," Digest of Papers of the Computer Society Computer Conference Compcon, US, Los Alamitos, IEEE Computer Society Press, vol. Conf. 41, 25 Feb 1996, pages 52-57, XP000628465
	AS	Evans, E., and Rogers, D., "Using Java Applets and Corba For Multi-User Distributed Applications," IEEE Internet Computing, US, vol. 1, no. 3, May 1997 - June 1997, pages 43-55, XP002080603
	AT	

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED